DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 744 SO 016 557

AUTHOR	McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin; And Others
TITLE	Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts. Volume III: Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, CA.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-8330-0607-X
PUB DATE	Dec 84
NOTE	27p.; For volumes I and II, see SO 016 555-556. For related document, see SO 016 497.
AVAILABLE FROM	Rand Corporation, 1700 Main St., P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90406-2138 (Order No. R-3161/3-JPG, $4.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Aesthetic Education; Art Appreciation; *Art Education; Art History; Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Educational Change; Educational Needs; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS	Art Criticism

ABSTRACT

This volume summarizes the findings from a cross-site analysis of seven sites that were implementing a discipline-based approach to visual arts education. A discipline-based approach incorporates four art disciplines: art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and art making. The study focused on two major areas: factors generating support for a strong substantive art education program in a district's curriculum, and factors influencing the willingness and ability of school districts and teachers to carry out and maintain a discipline-based art program. The first of four sections proposes the following conclusions: (1) the change to discipline-based art programs requires more than a change in policies and programs--it requires a shift in perspective; (2) to ensure the continuation of these programs, district policies will have to include extensive in-service teacher training, a prescriptive, comprehensive curriculum, and classroom review by district representatives; (3) programs must have politically adept advocates to generate interest in change, moral and financial support of administrators, and the support and commitment of teachers, parents, and students. Section II describes the basic requirements for art programs and considers the factors crucial for success at three stages of change. Section III briefly describes the art programs at the study sites. The section IV addresses the major issues involved in changing to a substantive visual arts program. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257744

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tom Cockrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production

An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts

Volume III: Executive Summary

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas, Joyce Peterson

SP 016 557

Rand

The research described in this report was sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
(Revised for vol. 3)
Main entry under title:

Art history, art criticism, and art production.

"Prepared for the J. Paul Getty Trust."
Vol. 3 by Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas, Joyce Peterson, with contributions from Michael Day ... [et al.].
Includes bibliographical references.
Contents: — v. 2. Case studies of seven selected sites — v. 3. Executive summary.
"R-3161/ -JPG."
1. Art—Study and teaching (Elementary)—United States—Case studies. 2. Art—Study and teaching (Secondary)—United States—Case studies. I. Day, Michael, 1938- . II. McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, 1941- . III. Thomas, Margaret A., 1945- . IV. Peterson, Joyce E., 1934- . V. Rand Corporation.
N353.A76 1984 707'.1273 84-17996
ISBN 0-8330-0607-X (v. 3)

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Published by The Rand Corporation

R-3161/3-JPG

Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production

An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Volume III: Executive Summary

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas, Joyce Peterson
With contributions from:
Michael Day, Brigham Young University
Elliot Eisner, Stanford University
Robert Stake, University of Illinois
Brent Wilson, Pennsylvania State University
Marjorie Wilson, Art Education Consultant

December 1984

Prepared for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts of the J. Paul Getty Trust

Rand
1700 MAIN STREET
P.O. BOX 2138
SANTA MONICA, CA 90406-2138

PREFACE

This report summarizes the case reports and cross-site analysis of seven sites selected for a study of visual arts education. The study examines public school programs that try to provide balanced instruction in art criticism, art history, and art production. The research is sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust. The Getty selected five educators with art education evaluation experience to develop the case reports and two Rand policy analysts with experience in analyzing educational change to conduct the cross-site analysis. Both studies are published by The Rand Corporation and appear as separate volumes in this study series.

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and Margaret A. Thomas, *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. I. Comparing the Process of Change Across Districts*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/1-JPG, December 1984.

Michael Day, Elliot Eisner, Robert Stake, Brent Wilson, and Marjorie Wilson, *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. II. Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/2-JPG, December 1984.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A study of this magnitude would not be possible without the cooperation of many people. In particular, we are indebted to the school district staffs in the study sites for responding so openly and fully to our inquiries. Only parsimony prevents us from acknowledging every respondent by name. We would like to thank several key respondents in each site, however, for this study would not have been possible without their assistance: Dr. Newman Walker, Superintendent, Mr. John Martin, Assistant Superintendent, and Ms. Kay Alexander, Art Specialist, Palo Alto, California; Dr. Eldon Gleichman, Superintendent, and Ms. Michele Olsen, Art Specialist, Champaign, Illinois; Mr. Robert Oaks, Superintendent, and Ms. Nancy Roucher, Director, Project HEART, Decatur, Illinois; Dr. Arthur Bruning, Superintendent, Dr. Frank Brendemuehl, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Ms. Carol Sirrine, Fine Arts Specialist, and Ms. Nancy Pauly, Elementary Art Specialist, Hopkins, Minnesota; Dr. Jerrold Glassman, Superintendent, and Ms. Aileen Golden, Cultural Arts Supervisor, Brooklyn, New York; Mr. Robert Zimpfer, Superintendent, Ms. Janice Plank and Ms. Elizabeth Katz, Art Specialists, Whitehall, Ohio; Dr. E. E. Brickell, Superintendent, Ms. Stefana Runyan, Art Supervisor, Virginia Beach, Virginia; Dr. Lee McMurrin, Superintendent, and Mr. Kent Anderson, Curriculum Specialist for Art, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

We extend very special thanks to Ms. Leilani Lattin Duke, Director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. In her capacity as The Getty Trust's Project Officer, she served as an inspiration to us all. We were fortunate to have her active involvement and guidance throughout the study's duration.

Thanks are also given to our technical reviewers, who made many useful suggestions for improvements on earlier drafts of this report: Dr. Richard Shavelson of The Rand Corporation; Dr. Robert Saunders, Art Consultant, Connecticut State Department of Education; Dr. Madeleine Grumet, Professor of Education, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Dr. James Mason, Dean of College of Fine Arts, Brigham Young University; and Dr. D. Jack Davis, Professor of Art and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, North Texas State University.

Finally, we would like to thank the many people who helped get this report published: Louise McLaurin, who took rough copy and graciously turned it into typed copy—again and again; Helen Turin, who from a hospital bed performed editorial miracles on earlier drafts; Sally Kostal, who kept track of everything and kept it all moving into production; Peg Schumacher, who along with other very competent professionals in the Rand Publications Department—too numerous to mention—turned the bits and pieces into a finished product.

All of these people made this study possible and substantially improved the result. They are, of course, in no way responsible for any shortcomings it may contain.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

Section

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY 1
- The Problem 1
- Nature of the Study 2
- Major Conclusions 3

II. CRITICAL FACTORS IN CHANGING ART EDUCATION 5
- Basic Program Characteristics 5
- Critical Factors in Establishing New Art Programs 6

III. ISSUES EXEMPLIFIED BY THE CASE STUDIES 12
- Whitehall, Ohio 12
- Hopkins, Minnesota 12
- Palo Alto, California 13
- Decatur and Champaign, Illinois 13
- Brooklyn #15, New York 14
- Milwaukee, Wisconsin 14
- Virginia Beach, Virginia 15
- Summary 15

IV. ISSUES SURROUNDING A SUBSTANTIVE ART PROGRAM 17
- Support for Art Education 17
- Lack of Model Programs 18
- Professional Development 19
- Lack of a Knowledge Base 19

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

THE PROBLEM

America's public schools have traditionally neglected art education, and, under present conditions, that neglect could become worse. When districts have to do more with fewer dollars, art instruction is often the first to suffer. Consequently, art programs have fared even worse than others under fiscal constraints. Further, very few school districts have ever considered art to be a basic cognitive subject the way they do mathematics, language, and science. Thus, the current emphasis on "basics" could well make art's status in the public schools even more tenuous and peripheral than it is today.

That status reflects two pervasive attitudes toward art education: art, per se, is not vital to a child's education, and instruction in the visual arts is not properly an *educational* activity. In the latter view, it requires little or no formal education to experience, comprehend, and create the arts. Both views conspire to keep policy attention and school resources focused elsewhere.

However, for the last 20 years, leading art educators have been challenging these attitudes and advocating a change.[1] They have argued that art education is as fundamentally important for personal development as training in mathematics, English, and science. It nurtures imaginative cognition. It develops understanding and appreciation of man's highest artistic achievements. It deepens understanding of culture and history. And it sharpens perceptive and analytical skills that are vital for higher-order mental tasks.

Given this rationale, art advocates have urged that the schools take a more comprehensive and rigorous approach to art education. Ideally, this approach should generate substantive art programs that provide balanced, sequential instruction in four domains: art criticism, art history, studio production and aesthetics.[2] The balance is very important. In the past, even schools that emphasized art education generally assumed that art classes should, by definition, focus on production. This focus encourages only one kind of response to art.

A substantive, sequential program that addressed those four domains would develop various kinds of awareness and skills in students. It would:

- Help them understand the historical and cultural contexts in which art is created;
- Encourage them to describe, analyze, and interpret works of art;
- Provide them with opportunities to create their own works; and
- Sharpen their perception of aesthetic effects in nature, in the manmade environment, and in works of art.

Such a program of instruction would necessarily be "discipline-based," just as any subject that requires formal instruction should be. In this case, the program would build on the body

[1]See, for example, M. Barkan, "Transition in Art Education: Changing Conceptions of Curricular Content and Teaching," *Art Education*, October 1962, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp. 12–18. H. S. Broudy, "Arts Education: Necessary or Just Nice?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1979, *Vol. 60*, pp. 347–350. E. Eisner (ed.), *The Arts, Human Development and Education*, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California, 1976. J. McFee and R. Degge, *Art, Culture and Environment: A Catalyst for Teaching*, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., Belmont, California, 1977.

[2]By "aesthetics," we mean the study of art's nature, value, and role in society. By balance, we mean parity in terms of the status or value a program accords each of the domains, rather than equal instructional time spent on each.

of expertise, scholarship, and exemplary works generated by art theory, art criticism, art education, and art history.

This concept accords well with the view that teachers, school boards, practitioners, and the public hold about the fundamental purposes of schooling and the importance of rigor. Moreover, several recent studies have questioned the arts' peripheral role in education. In evaluating the condition of public education, these studies have recognized the arts' contribution to complete education and have recommended their inclusion in the general curriculum.[3] Subsequently, many school administrators and teachers are reassessing traditional notions of a well-rounded education. Although they reaffirm the importance of language, mathematics, science, and computer literacy, they have begun to consider balancing the curriculum with subjects that nurture non-verbal, non-linear thought, develop understanding of diverse cultural values, and foster non-verbal communication. Consequently, the times are more favorable than they may seem for advocating substantive art programs.

The J. Paul Getty Trust, a private operating foundation, has taken this shift in attitude as an opportunity to work with school personnel and the arts communities to improve the quality of art education. In pursuit of this goal, the Trust created the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in 1982.[4]

Two important premises guide the Center's activities. First, because the arts are a repository of culture, study of the arts is a principal means of understanding human experience and transmitting cultural values. Second, if a significant change is to occur in the way the arts are perceived by the public and taught in the schools, we need greater understanding of what constitutes art education and how it can be taught. To foster that understanding, the Center supported a systematic examination of public school programs that try to provide well-rounded instruction in the visual arts. This report summarizes the major findings and conclusions of that study.

As the study found, there is no "one way" to make the change to a comprehensive art program. Those who want changes must consider not only their programmatic objectives but also the institutional setting. However, the study did permit us to identify the basic characteristics such a program must have, to outline the factors crucial for successfully establishing it, and to clarify the issues that change raises. We believe this information will provide a useful base that advocates can build on in their own contexts.

NATURE OF THE STUDY

A fundamental problem for the study was finding districts that were attempting to provide art education in art history and criticism, as well as production.[5] To this end, we interviewed more than 100 experts on art education across the country, asking them to nominate sites for the study. From the sites nominated, we collected program materials that would give

[3]E. L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, Harper and Row, New York, 1983, and J. Goodlad, *A Place Called School*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1984.

[4]The Center is one of several operating entities of the J. Paul Getty Trust. The others include: The J. Paul Getty Museum; the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities; the Getty Conservation Institute; the Art History Information Program; the Metropolitan Museum/Getty Program for Art on Film; and the Museum Management Institute.

[5]In the study's early stages, we defined a substantive art program as one that encompassed the three domains of art history, criticism, and production. Since then, the sponsor's concept of such a program has come to separate the discipline of aesthetics from that of the other three and include it as a separate domain. Unfortunately, this change came after the site studies were made. Consequently, we did not systematically examine this aspect of the programs and the report does not discuss it.

us an idea of their curricula, philosophical approach, and special components. The Getty Center selected five educators experienced in evaluating art programs to see whether these sites seemed to have anything like a discipline-based, sequential program that included the three domains.[6]

Based on this review, we identified 12 potential sites, each of which was visited by one or two of the art educators. These preliminary site visits resulted in selection of seven districts: Palo Alto, California; Brooklyn #15, New York; Whitehall, Ohio; Hopkins, Minnesota; Virginia Beach, Virginia; Champaign-Decatur, Illinois; Milwaukee, Wisconsin. We selected these sites not because their art education programs were exemplary but because they are all trying to develop or maintain district-wide art programs that encompass the three domains.

The project made two studies of these sites. The first was a cross-site analysis aimed at answering two major questions: What are the critical characteristics of a discipline-based art education program? And why are some sites more successful than others in establishing and maintaining such programs? To answer these questions, we visited the sites and collected data on the districts' art education programs, their place in the districts' curricula, and the factors that contributed to their development and should affect their future course. All our data-collecting activities were guided by a focus on factors that appeared important at three stages of change—initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.

In the second study, each of the five art evaluation researchers conducted comprehensive case studies at one or more of the sites. Each case study captures distinctive features of the district's art program and the context in which it operates. The researchers gathered data for these studies by interviewing principal actors in the systems, observing instruction and field trips, and attending art shows and planning and curriculum meetings. They also provided supplementary data for the cross-site analysis.

This executive summary focuses on the larger policy issues and critical factors for change that emerged from the studies, primarily the cross-site analysis. Readers interested in a more detailed discussion of that analysis should consult the project report.[7] Those who would like a more comprehensive picture of particular art programs and the experiences of districts attempting change should see the case studies.[8] Some sites provide especially instructive insights into certain issues, problems, and factors influencing change. Moreover, the case studies have also raised issues that go beyond change and that deserve the attention of art educators, policymakers, and district and school administrators.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

The cross-site analysis and the case studies provide such rich material that it is hard to summarize their major conclusions in a few words. However, several points emerged repeatedly. First, the change to a discipline-based art program requires more than a change in policies and practices—it requires a shift in perspective. Previous Rand work has shown that

---

[6]Michael Day, Brigham Young University; Elliot Eisner, Stanford University; Robert Stake, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana; Brent Wilson, Pennsylvania State University; and Marjorie Wilson, Art Education Consultant.

[7]M. W. McLaughlin and M. A. Thomas, *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. I. Comparing the Process of Change Across Districts*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/1-JPG.

[8]M. Day et al., *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. II. Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/2-JPG.

any kind of institutional change is difficult to design, initiate, and implement.[9] It is even more difficult when people must accept new concepts and develop new attitudes. People at all levels will have to alter their assumptions about the value of art, its place in the curriculum, and how it should be taught. Until this happens, substantive art education will not have the broad support needed to make such a tremendous change.

Second, art programs will have to be conceived, developed, and maintained as other basic programs are. This means that university scholars will have to work closely with curriculum specialists and teachers to develop programs informed by the theory, body of expertise, and exemplary works of art criticism, history, and production. To ensure the continuing integrity of these programs, district policies will have to include extensive in-service teacher training; a prescriptive, comprehensive curriculum; and classroom review by district representatives.

Third, programs must have politically adept advocates to generate interest in change. They must also have the moral and financial support of district and school administrators, and the support and commitment of teachers, parents, and students, at every stage of change. The analysis also repeatedly showed that program viability, consistency, and quality depended critically on the coordination and other support provided by a district-level art specialist. Only with this broad support can programs be developed, put in place, and successfully maintained despite financial constraints and changes in the environment.

Beyond the problems involved in change, art educators will have to consider other issues before art education can realize its potential. A major challenge is the lack of a knowledge base and of model programs. We really know very little about the present status of art education or about exactly what a discipline-based, sequential program should look like. Another issue is the need for professional development at all levels of the system. Moreover, the benefits of this development must be reinforced by continuing interaction between theorists and practitioners, universities and schools. Finally, advocates must address the potential problem for teachers of reconciling artistic creation with a prescriptive curriculum. Although the cross-site analysis suggests that this conflict is more perceived than real, that perception can keep teachers from accepting and supporting a new art program.

The remainder of the report discusses these ideas in greater detail. Section II describes the basic requirements for art programs and considers the factors crucial for success at three stages of change. Section III briefly describes the art programs at the study sites and some of the issues identified by the case studies. Section IV addresses the major issues surrounding change to a substantive visual arts program.

---

[9]P. Berman and M. W. McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: Volume 8. Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/8-HEW, 1978.

II. CRITICAL FACTORS IN CHANGING ART EDUCATION

Our study makes clear that no ideal program exists or probably can be developed that would achieve the goals of discipline-based art education in all district environments. The case studies show how profoundly such district features as resources, political climate, staff expertise, and educational philosophy shape art education practices and generate considerable differences in program scope, goals, and methods. However, regardless of a program's conceptual approach and substance, the process and problems of change will be similar. Consequently, we have not tried to describe a substantive model, based on programs at seven sites; rather, we have attempted to identify some principles governing successful change by analyzing the experience at those sites. Because influential people at every site advocated change to a more comprehensive art education program, we have learned a lot from analyzing why some succeeded more than others.

BASIC PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Although successful programs may differ in approach and substance, our research suggests that a visual arts program must have certain basic characteristics to become academically "respectable" and support the factors necessary for successful change. These characteristics are

- An articulated conceptual base,
- A written curriculum,
- A sequential curriculum.

An Articulated Conceptual Base

Where a district's program has no articulated conceptual base, it is difficult to view art as a discipline. Unless a district adopts and articulates a coherent theoretical approach to art education, it will have difficulty achieving parity among the three domains, much less consistency across classrooms. Teachers will simply follow their often uninformed predilections. All our study sites did subscribe to a perspective that valued instruction in the three domains. However, depending on how it was articulated, the theory informing a three-domain curriculum affected instruction more or less.

A Written Curriculum

Theory is not enough to change or galvanize classroom practice. Theoretical concepts must be embodied in a written curriculum that includes examples to guide classroom activities. It is not enough to deliver a statement of theory and encourage teachers to tailor their favorite art lessons to this theory. When teachers try to graft newly acquired concepts of history and criticism onto familiar routines, uncertainty arises and production continues to dominate. Nor is it always sufficient to let teachers develop their own lessons around concepts stated so broadly that they support various approaches. This strategy can foster innovation in the art curriculum. Ironically, it can also constrain invention if teachers do not fully grasp concepts

and thus lack confidence to explore new ideas. Our comparison of sites showed clearly that a highly specific curriculum can actually foster creativity. By describing program objectives and clear goals for practice, a written curriculum provides the structure necessary for confident pursuit of new ideas and strategies.

A written curriculum also creates a surer basis for evaluation, which is important for both curricular accountability and program development. Unless strategies and objectives are clearly stated and understood, it is difficult to assess how well they have been realized or to identify areas for improvement.

A Sequential Curriculum

In the other basic subjects, such as reading and mathematics, continuity is a key attribute of the effective curriculum. Each grade assumes and builds on what the student learns in earlier grades or other domains. To be treated as an academic subject, art should evidence this kind of continuity. Just as a written curriculum is necessary to link theory and classroom practice and to promote balance among the three domains, a sequential curriculum is an effective means of ensuring program continuity.

CRITICAL FACTORS IN ESTABLISHING NEW ART PROGRAMS

A district may articulate theoretical concepts and embody them in a sequential, written curriculum, yet still fail to establish an art program that balances instruction among the three domains, has internal consistency, or maintains high quality. Programs will lack these attributes unless district policies and practices support curricular objectives. Despite the substantive diversity of programs, some factors appear to be crucial at all stages of planning and carrying out an art education program.

- Active support from administrators, teachers, parents, and students;
- Financial and other resources, such as time, space, and expert consulting help;
- The active involvement of an art specialist.[1]

Art education has suffered from neglect, not resistance. Consequently, the most important factor is the commitment to change that translates into resources and active support from all levels of the system. Our district-based programs second the literature's contention that support should be backed by local education policy and must reflect wide agreement that the program has educational worth and is needed. Unless district board members and administrators believe that an arts program serves the district's overall goals, they will not allocate scarce resources to it nor give it a place in district priorities. Unless the community supports the program, school board members and administrators are unlikely to keep it afloat with budget dollars.

However, this support will not make a new art program secure unless teachers and principals understand and endorse the program's merit and methods. Where school-level support is missing, pro forma implementation is the probable result. Nothing will really change in the classroom. The support of non-art teachers is also critical. If they view art as recreation

[1]Art specialists, as distinct from specialist art teachers, are resource people, who also often function in supervisory roles and serve more than one school in a district. Traditionally, they have acted as instructors who periodically taught special sessions of regular art classes. However, many districts no longer have art specialists, and those that do need to get the maximum educational effect from their efforts.

rather than as a serious academic subject, that attitude can have a strong influence on students, parents, and others. At the study sites, most (if not all) teachers esteemed art as an important instructional area.

This broad support must also generate resources other than dollars. They include the expert help needed to develop programs that incorporate the three domains, time in school and district schedules for a substantive art education program, physical space for both productive and responsive activities, and facilities and human resources for training teachers and supporting their efforts.

The study programs reflect different levels of district support and resource commitment at the sites. District administrators at some sites engaged in active partnership with program staff to find and allocate resources at all stages of change. At other sites, district interests and constraints limited district personnel to moral support, and program staff had to marshal resources. This was especially true for districts that faced severe fiscal limitations.

The active involvement of art specialists also contributed greatly to effective program outcomes at our study sites. Specialists provided guidelines in materials and curriculum development and in convincing district administrators of the importance of art. Students clearly benefited where districts were able to provide specialists who periodically gave "model" classroom instruction. However, the art specialist's crucial role was as coordinator and facilitator, complementing and supporting the activities of classroom teachers responsible for art instruction. Art specialists serving this function brought a special and invaluable vitality, consistency, challenge, and rigor to the program, whether it was staffed primarily by generalist or by specialist teachers.

A coordinator would undoubtedly enhance any art education activity. But in discipline-based programs that attend to the three domains, this specialist role is essential. Few individual teachers had the perspective, the time, or the expertise to identify opportunities for integrating new materials and strategies or learning from colleagues' practices. Art specialists serving as coordinators and facilitators were able to address these important tasks.

As we said, these three factors are essential to an art program's success at all three stages of change. However, other factors are especially critical at given stages and continue to affect programs farther down the line.

Factors Critical for Initiation

At the initiation stage, we found three other critical elements:

- Presence of a politically skilled advocate,
- Outside resources,
- Strategies for involving teachers and principals.

The Arts Advocate. Because art education is a "non-issue" in most school districts, strong, three-domain programs will not be considered without the influence of an articulate, politically skilled arts advocate. Only such a person can make the district and the community recognize the need for substantive art education and mobilize the resources for getting it underway. Where there is no support for art education, advocacy must be more than substantive—it must be expressly political. This study has convinced us that political skills are among the most crucial and neglected components of fundamental reform in art education. Without them, advocates cannot generate the support and build the coalitions to press for change.

It did not matter where these advocates came from, but their presence was the catalytic factor. In only two districts did advocacy originate with central office staff. Elsewhere, this necessary and effective "push" came from various quarters. In one district the arts advocates came from the teaching staff; in two others, the central office art specialists were the prime movers. In another, a community activist built the coalition that designed, implemented, and disseminated the program.

Outside Resources. Even when an arts advocate can elicit or reinforce district and community support, outside resources often prove crucial to initiate an art program. Federal funds figured strongly at three of our sites. Funds from private foundations and the state department of education were crucial at another. Resources besides funds also proved important. For example, staff responsible for curriculum development at several sites discovered that existing models were not appropriate and that they did not have the theoretical background to develop a conceptual framework. They were given critical advice and assistance by university-based art educators and, at one site, by state department of education specialists.

Strategies To Involve Teachers and Principals. Past research has found that successful implementation of new programs depends heavily on involving teachers and principals early in project planning. Because they are the key actors in any education program, their support and commitment ultimately determine how effective a program will be. In our study, the districts whose art programs evidently enjoyed the strongest teacher and principal commitment were the ones that made the greatest efforts to involve them during initiation. This involvement took various forms, but by the implementation phase teachers and principals were strongly committed to the programs and to maintaining a strong art education effort.

Factors Critical for Implementation

In addition to support and resource commitment, we found that three factors were critical in carrying out art programs:

- Concrete, ongoing training;
- Well-specified instructional goals;
- Central coordination.

Inevitably, the weaknesses and strengths of the planning or initiation phase carried over and provided a shaky or solid base for implementation activities. Ongoing training ideally builds on teacher involvement during initiation. Well-specified instructional goals reflect the quality of advocacy and the level of expertise that shaped the adoption phase. And active central coordination implies the degree of district support and commitment to the program.

Concrete, Ongoing Training. Implementing a three-domain art program presents a very high-order learning task for teachers. First, the methodology of art education is underdeveloped compared with that of, say, math and sciences. Second, there is even less guidance for programs that incorporate criticism and history. Third, in addition to new content and methods, teachers have to shift their perspective on art education.[2] Much of the learning they need to implement the new program should take place during the initiation phase. However, there is so much for teachers to absorb that training cannot be treated like a one-shot inoculation. Such a demanding program requires training that allows teachers to learn in increments

[2]That last reason explains why specialists as well as generalist teachers need concrete, ongoing training. Unlike most generalists, they are completely at home with production activities, but they must come to accept and practice the historical and critical elements of art education.

that are geared to their conceptual sophistication and to actual classroom practice.

The outcomes at our sites underlined how important this kind of training is. We judged the "outcome" of implementation by (1) how confident teachers were that they could carry out the program, (2) how well they actually did, (3) how consistent classroom activities were with program goals, and (4) how high and consistent the quality of classroom practices was across participating schools.

Outcomes across sites varied widely and correlated closely with training practices. In one district, teachers were given many opportunities to practice activities and skills in a workshop environment. After the workshop "rehearsals," these teachers were urged to try out new skills immediately in their classrooms, and project resource staff visited frequently to give them support and feedback on their efforts. Many of these teachers achieved a remarkable level of skill in a new conceptual approach and methods of art instruction. Moreover, their classroom practices were consistent with program goals.

Another district accomplished this by training a group of pilot teachers extensively in each unit of the curriculum and having the Elementary Art Specialist visit each classroom regularly to observe, demonstrate, and assist, as needed. These teachers thus received a tailored, practical training that allowed them to provide ongoing assistance to the other elementary teachers.

Well-specified Instructional Framework and Goals. A clearly defined conceptual framework is essential for academic rigor, and this framework must include specific instructional goals. Teachers find these elements critically important because implementation is a two-step process that involves learning the rules and then learning to do better. In the case of art education, where there is no "best practice," the rules of the game become even more important. Especially for generalist teachers, clearly specified frameworks and goals provide a reassuring base of operation.

We found that implementation outcomes related directly to the level of specificity. Where the curriculum specified the goals and conceptual parameters in detail, this characteristic contributed to program quality and consistency. This result cannot be dismissed as a *post hoc* fallacy: When asked, the teachers overwhelmingly cited the curriculum guide as a major source of their confidence in teaching and in maintaining high quality.

Active Central Coordination. Even with ongoing training and clearly specified guidelines, implementation has more chance to succeed if districts have art specialists who provide active central coordination. Through regular classroom visits, a specialist-coordinator can continually evaluate the program's developmental needs, monitor program consistency across classrooms, target technical assistance resources, and support teacher efforts. In programs that address the three domains, the coordinator also plays a crucial role in maintaining quality by identifying resources for the program. Few generalist teachers have the expertise or time to locate and prepare the varied materials required for a strong art program. Even the specialist teachers, who could be expected to have perfect confidence in choosing materials, commented that without someone to bring new materials to their attention, they would tend to rely on a static pool of resources. That tendency would vitiate program activities.

Factors Critical to Maintaining an Art Program

If a program has sufficient resources and support from district administrators, and has survived the implementation phase, it will probably be maintained—at least in form. However, formal institutionalization does not guarantee that a program will actually continue to realize

its potential or its goals. By our definition, a program is not fully institutionalized unless it has the fiscal, technical, material, and other resources necessary to support its continued operation and has in place the strategies to ensure a high and even level of program quality. The prospects for stable maintenance varied considerably among our sites, ranging from assured to uncertain to unlikely. These different outcomes indicated how important the following four elements are for institutionalization:

- A written curriculum,
- School principal commitment,
- Teacher training that supports learning,
- Strategies for program review and development.

A Written Curriculum. As we implied in describing the basic characteristics of a discipline-based arts program, a written curriculum is essential for institutionalization. Ideally, it embodies the program's theoretical base; it ensures stability and consistency of practices over time; and it actually encourages creativity rather than stifling it, by making teachers secure about the program's conceptual parameters. Perhaps most important for this study's basic concern, a written curriculum gives art the same academic "respectability" that the other basic subjects have and makes it subject to the same kinds of accountability standards. The sites that had the most successful programs also had the most specific, comprehensive, and prescriptive curricula.

Commitment of School Principals. Districts planning a strong arts program would do well to secure their principals' commitment to that program. Other studies have consistently documented the importance of that commitment to any planned change effort.[3] Our study reveals that it is very important for art programs. Teachers generally take their cue from principals about the importance of subjects and activities and about the expectations for instruction. For art, a traditionally "marginal" subject, the principal's signals are especially critical. Given the demands that generalist teachers face, they will quite rationally use the principal's priorities to allocate their own time and attention.

If principals express no explicit commitment to a district program, art education activities will reflect teacher preferences. However, if principals express preferences at odds with a district program, that program may not be fully institutionalized in their schools. At our sites, long-term prospects for art education varied according to the principals' interests and assumptions about art education.

Teacher Training that Supports Learning. To remain vital, education programs should provide for the teacher training needs that a changing environment generates. It is not enough to give teachers survival skills. Districts should ensure ongoing and more comprehensive training for teachers in the program and take steps to see that new staff acquire the skills and perspective that a three-domain program requires.

During implementation, teachers usually receive considerable feedback about their instruction and support to carry on—even if they haven't actually learned the central concepts and skills. However, after institutionalization, much of this support is withdrawn, and teachers may find it difficult to continue program activities, much less make them consistently effective. Consequently, districts need to provide for continuing in-service education that allows time for teachers to work through the survival, consolidation, and mastery stages.

---

[3]M. Fullan, *The Meaning of Educational Change*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1982.

Some of our sites mounted good examples of training programs that addressed each developmental stage. They typically began by demonstrating the pedagogical power of the new program in order to motivate the teachers during the initiation phase. They followed this with demonstration and practice of activities that embodied program concepts, and they provided feedback about teacher efforts during the implementation phase. Since the end of that phase, these districts have continued with in-service sessions that focus explicitly on the conceptual rationale of the teachers' new knowledge and roles. By doing so, they have prepared the teachers to identify new material and develop new activities on their own, but that will still accord with program objectives. At sites where we observed variation within and across the three domains, much of that variation results from teachers not having fully grasped the theoretical principles underlying program practices.

Strategies for Program Review and Development. Programs that do not get reviewed and are not continually developing will stagnate and eventually bore both teachers and students. Program relevance will erode over time as students change and as teachers' interests and competence develop. Once programs are institutionalized, districts should not assume that they are immutable and self-sustaining. To guarantee that they will retain their vitality, reviews should go beyond monitoring the quality of classroom practices. They should also continue to address the relevance of underlying concepts and of the curriculum's substance—especially where activities and materials are prescribed.

For example, one district has institutionalized a review procedure that should ensure the vitality of its art program. It has created standing committees for each of the major subject areas, including art. These committees comprise supervisors, parents, teachers, counselors, and students. The art committee meets several times a year to examine how unified the curriculum is and to receive suggestions and recommendations for change. This strategy guarantees not only that the curriculum is reviewed but also that it will continue to be shaped by the concerns and needs of people at all system levels. All of the programs we examined were evolving and changing to reflect changed conditions, professional growth, and new interests. Routine review and revision procedures contribute substantially to this programmatic vitality.

III. ISSUES EXEMPLIFIED BY THE CASE STUDIES

The cross-site analysis identified the factors contributing to successful development, implementation, and maintenance of art education programs. The case studies provide specific illustrations of diverse ways of thinking and going about these tasks and of other issues involved in establishing substantive art programs. This executive summary cannot hope to capture the richness of those studies. However, brief descriptions can provide some sense of the sites' diversity and illuminate the factors and issues we have been discussing. One issue was strikingly apparent at all the sites—the vital importance of a district art specialist who acts as both coordinator and advocate. Other recurrent issues were the importance of in-service training, the need for collaboration between university specialists and curriculum developers, and the effect of a formal curriculum.

WHITEHALL, OHIO

Whitehall's experience clearly illustrates how important it is for a district to get help from theoreticians in developing a curriculum and to have an art specialist-coordinator. This suburb of Columbus has one high, one junior high, and four elementary schools. Having art in these schools is a Whitehall tradition. Nevertheless, several years ago the district took steps to formalize the place of art in the curriculum. This provided the district's specialist teachers with an opportunity to develop their own program and to incorporate elements of art history and art criticism.

With no experience in curriculum development, these teachers approached the task by having each teacher record her favorite art lessons and overlay art criticism and history on those lessons. They documented the lessons on cards, specifying the lesson's focus and appropriate grade levels and suggesting classroom activities, resources, and materials needed for the activities. Although the resulting curriculum was both usable and noteworthy, studio activities continued to dominate, largely because the concepts mapped onto familiar routines were newly acquired and not fully assimilated.

Recognizing their need for help with translating theory into practice, the Whitehall teachers sought assistance from the Art Consultant at the Ohio State Department of Education. This interaction motivated them to continue developing the program. However, its kind and duration did not enable them to give the program a wholly consistent theoretical base. Program progress is further hindered because the teachers can devote only nights, weekends, and summers to curriculum development. Besides their teaching responsibilities, they must also act as advocates for the program and provide whatever coordination they can. Whitehall has no central office art supervisor.

Whitehall's program continues to evolve slowly. Although it still reflects its eclectic beginnings, it is gradually maturing as the teachers gain understanding of the concepts that should inform it and seek assistance in translating theory into practice.

HOPKINS, MINNESOTA

In making the change and structuring its substantive art program, the Hopkins school district took actions that have resulted in a written curriculum for grades K-6 that incorporates the three domains, accommodates child development, and is sequential. Its experience

illustrates the positive effects of community support, university/school cooperation, a district art supervisor, and in-service training.

Hopkins is a small suburban district with one high, two junior high, and six elementary schools. Unlike Whitehall, it does not have a long tradition of school art programs. However, spurred by community interest, the district administration took steps to initiate an art program several years ago. It appointed a half-time Fine Arts Supervisor who gathered a team of teachers to develop the curriculum. This team worked closely with a Professor of Art Education at the University of Minnesota. This cooperative effort has produced a theoretically based, prescriptive curriculum that ensures the quality and consistency of classroom teaching.

The curriculum developers chose to make the curriculum prescriptive because it is implemented by generalist classroom teachers who did not have substantial graduate training in art education. To further assist these teachers on unfamiliar ground, the district designed an extremely thorough, mandatory in-service training program. To develop wider support, during the development process, the district also held shorter in-service sessions with district administrators and school principals. The district has also hired an elementary art specialist who circulates among the six elementary schools to model lessons, secure the resources that each school needs, and provide support as needed. Hopkins is currently developing a 7–12 art curriculum.

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA

Palo Alto's art program again illustrates how necessary a central specialist-coordinator is for art programs. It also brings up the issue of in-service training, particularly the approach a district takes. The district has an active art program, taught by art specialists at the two middle and two senior high schools, and by generalist teachers at the 14 elementary schools. It serves an affluent community that has high standards of excellence and sends 90 percent of its graduating seniors to colleges and universities.

The district employs a full-time Art Consultant to serve the schools, particularly the elementary grades. She has kept art highly visible in a district that emphasizes basic skills. In an effort to improve the district's art education, she has developed a discipline-based program, SPECTRA (Special Teacher Resources for Art), designed to be implemented over a three-year period. SPECTRA provides a model of art education instruction for classroom teachers by bringing community artists into grade 3–6 classrooms. Specially trained in art education by the district Art Consultant, these artists conduct weekly one-hour art lessons. The lessons are designed to give students an organized, comprehensive introduction to art heritage, art appreciation, and aesthetics, and practice with various artistic media and techniques.

About 80 percent of the district's 3–6 teachers have been involved in SPECTRA. That involvement is their only in-service training and is phased over the three-year period. For the first year, the classroom teachers only observe. During the next two years, they are expected to participate and to conduct at least one lesson, assisted by the SPECTRA artists. Because SPECTRA is just completing its final year, its effectiveness as a model cannot be assessed yet. It is too early to tell whether its kind of in-service training can enable elementary classroom teachers to carry on a discipline-based, sequential program on their own.

DECATUR AND CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS

These two districts demonstrate the role of community support, art advocates, and outside resources in getting a substantive art program under way and maintaining it. Both districts have suffered severe fiscal constraints and have had to reduce the resources devoted to

art education, although district concern with art education remains high. In that context, a community activist in Decatur used her knowledge of the community and its organization to build a coalition of university personnel, community service agencies, and school personnel. With funds from Title IV-C of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, they designed, carried out, and disseminated an aesthetics-based visual arts program to the schools. Project HEART (Helping Education Through Art Resources for Teachers) found a receptive audience among the two districts' administrations and staff. They saw it as an opportunity for interested teachers to take part in a comprehensive art education program at no district cost, and they encouraged teacher participation.

Project HEART has several distinctive features. It bases activities in all three domains on major works of art and architecture. Works of art, including reproductions of classic art works, provide the focus for analysis that emphasizes elements of design and the inspiration for making art. Project HEART has sought a high degree of articulation between art and general education (an issue we discuss in the last section of this report). The elementary classroom teachers can use art and principles of aesthetic awareness to convey concepts and enhance learning in any area—e.g., in social studies classes to analyze the artifacts of different cultures.

Project HEART performs the roles of service center and staff development specialists. It provides a series of workshops for participating teachers that explain the program's philosophy, demonstrate activities, and give them opportunities for practice. Project HEART personnel also support the classroom teachers by collecting and distributing program materials and providing refresher workshops.

BROOKLYN #15, NEW YORK

Brooklyn #15 is one of the 32 independent community school districts in New York City, a major cultural center for the arts. Its district administration is strongly committed to the visual arts. However, because it has a strong commitment to school-site autonomy and decentralization, this district does not have, and probably would not accept, a formalized art program, much less a prescriptive curriculum. In such a setting, the importance of a highly motivated, energetic, and knowledgeable district specialist/advocate cannot be overestimated.

The district administration encourages classroom teachers to provide art education that incorporates the three domains. However, the credit for any programmatic consistency across classrooms goes to the Cultural Arts Supervisor. She has worked to instill her vision of art education in the district's schools by seeking to have at least one classroom teacher at each school designated an art cluster teacher; securing outside grants for the program; and arranging classroom visits, lesson modeling, after-school workshops, and district-wide contests and art shows. To provide models, she works from a base of 52 lesson plans that she developed as a classroom teacher, with supplements from the New York City and State Guides. Although production activities continue to dominate, she has encouraged some program consistency and attention to art history through the selection of yearly instructional themes and a periodic newsletter sent to all the district's schools. The district also takes advantage of its proximity to exceptional cultural facilities by, for example, offering programs in conjunction with the Lincoln Center for the Arts and the Brooklyn Museum.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

Milwaukee's experience again suggests the importance of strong district support, a central coordinator, a written curriculum, and outside resources. Art has been a part of the Milwaukee Public Schools' curriculum for about 110 years. It currently has 49 high school art teachers and 32 middle school art teachers serving the district's 34 secondary schools. Elementary art is taught by 14 art specialists in 24 of the district's 102 elementary schools. In the remainder, elementary classroom teachers provide art instruction, supervised by the district's six supervising art teachers. The latter and the district's Curriculum Specialist provide the major leadership for art.

As an active member in a large number of local and national organizations, the district's Curriculum Specialist for Art Education keeps abreast of events in art education and brings vision to the program. The district administration provides important resource and visible support to the program. Over the years, they have developed a K-12 art curriculum that is comprehensive, sequential, and encompasses the three domains.

Milwaukee also operates numerous specialty schools that provide art education through different models. Most of these schools received initial funding through the Emergency School Assistance Act. As "magnets," they were organized to foster racial integration in the district. Currently, the district operates an elementary and middle school for the creative arts, an art museum satellite program, and a visual and performing arts high school.

VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA

More than any site besides Hopkins, Virginia Beach demonstrates how a discipline-based art program, embodied in a highly prescriptive curriculum, works to give art academic status equal to other educational disciplines. It also shows the importance of district support for that kind of program.

Art education has been an integral part of the Virginia Beach City Public Schools' program since the district's inception in the 1960s. Nevertheless, the district had difficulty in developing a comprehensive K-12 art curriculum. After several failed attempts, the district hired a specialist in art education and curriculum development. With strong moral and financial support from the administration, she convened a panel of teachers to flesh out the details of the conceptual framework she had constructed. The result is a highly prescriptive, comprehensive K-12 curriculum, which the district's 68 art specialist teachers follow closely. The district also has a central office Art Coordinator who oversees the program in its 59 elementary and secondary schools.

The Virginia Beach art curriculum incorporates the three domains and is sequential. Teachers know confidently what students have mastered at each preceding level. Because the curriculum specifies content in detail, school principals and other evaluators can easily judge how well the art teachers are adhering to the program. Rather than constraining them, the art teachers found that the curriculum served as a floor of operations: With confidence about the goals of each lesson, they could approach their teaching more creatively. Moreover, non-art personnel found that the curriculum made them view art as a cognitive discipline like the other basic subject areas. In short, the program enjoys—and has earned—strong support from the District Superintendent through the teaching staff.

SUMMARY

These brief descriptions do little more than hint at the richness of the case studies. However, they do suggest that, despite the diversity of sites, certain factors consistently affect the

fate and quality of substantive art programs. These site-level issues reflect some larger problems that must be addressed by art advocates, art scholars, and education policymakers before there can be a strong movement toward discipline-based art curricula in this country. We discuss these issues in the next section.

IV. ISSUES SURROUNDING A SUBSTANTIVE ART PROGRAM

Our study shows that districts can adopt and maintain visual arts programs that offer students education in art criticism, art history, and production. However, it also shows that changing public perceptions about the arts and learning more about how to provide that kind of education are major problems in making this change. Arts advocates, many art educators, and some practitioners believe a person without art education is not fully educated. Nevertheless, that belief has not assured art the status accorded traditional "academic" subjects or translated into sequential, discipline-based art programs in the schools. Several interrelated issues must be addressed before these things can happen: support for art education; the lack of model programs to guide development; professional development to support instruction and training; and the lack of a knowledge base to inform training, program development, and practice.

SUPPORT FOR ART EDUCATION

Without exception, our sites showed that districts become interested in substantive arts programs only where strong, politically adept advocates mobilize support. Traditional art education networks have yet to create demand for strong arts programs of any kind, much less to effectively mobilize the support it takes to change the priorities for art education. In the professional arts and art education networks, the members generally talk only to each other. They do not communicate with the people whose support is needed to change the status and fortunes of art. This is unfortunate because our study shows that multiple, legitimate voices calling for strong art education are strategically important for change.

As a first step in generating support, art educators must strengthen and activate the existing art education networks. They and arts advocates must then develop "issue networks" or webs of influence outside the field to generate interest and enthusiasm among such diverse groups as state legislators, parent and community groups, and educators not directly involved in art. The latter's support is essential for getting art accepted as a basic subject, creating demand for discipline-based art education, and nurturing the development of the art curriculum.

To accomplish those three ends, two changes are necessary. First, arts advocates must gain support for substantive arts programs by changing the leading ideas that motivate art education and shape classroom practice. Second, and dependent on the first, arts advocates must gain support in the policy system. That support is essential to changing structures and priorities that affect school system activities and give art education an inferior position in the curriculum.

The concept of art education we have been discussing is generally neither well-known nor understood. Production activities dominate classroom practice and teacher training because studio activities are thought to define the field—not because discipline-based art education in the three domains has been rejected. Art advocates need to make educational policymakers, teacher trainers, curriculum planners, art specialists, and elementary-level generalists aware of this "new" concept and enlist their support for it. Parents and other influential groups must also be motivated to demand this kind of art education.

Once this concept gains wider support, advocates must work to influence the "gatekeeping" mechanisms that establish priorities, direct assignment of resources, and generate demand. Among the most important of these are high school graduation and college entrance requirements, the content and objectives of standardized assessment measures, and the course work specified for generalist and specialist teaching credentials. These features of the education policy structure signal the relative importance of a subject or activity. They also focus attention on areas of study and "create space" for instructional areas in the curriculum.

College entrance requirements effectively determine the course of study for academically talented students because they specify necessary course work and implicitly give status to instructional areas. For most elite universities and many state higher-education systems, fine arts are not required for college entrance, and art courses do not "count" in determining entrance credits. Little wonder, then, that college candidates, their parents, and counselors give the arts low priority.. Standardized tests have a similar effect: In measuring student progress in elementary and secondary levels they generally ignore art. Finally, when teacher credential requirements do not make the arts necessary for elementary certification, teacher candidates get the message that the arts should have ancillary status.

LACK OF MODEL PROGRAMS

Model programs play an essential role in gaining support for substantive arts education and in providing guidance for practitioners. As our discussion of site selection suggests, very few models currently exist. Among the dozens of nominees, we could identify only 12 that seemed sufficiently promising to justify site visits, and, of those, only seven invited close study. Further, the cross-site analysis showed that only two of those seven had programs fully embodying the model we have been discussing. That is to say, only two had a sequential, discipline-based program that *balanced* art criticism, art history, and production and documented that program in a written, prescriptive curriculum. The others had strong programs but lacked one or another of the balance, the sequence, or the prescriptive curriculum.

The lack of model programs is self-perpetuating. Arts advocates have a better chance of generating support if they can *show* policymakers, administrators, teachers, and parents what a strong art program can accomplish. Accomplishment is especially important in gaining teacher interest and support. Teachers appropriately consider new or modified teaching practices with a conservative eye, which has often been labeled "teacher resistance to change," when actually it is professional concern about how a new practice will affect their students. Teachers are typically unwilling to change unless they have confidence that their students will do predictably better—or at least no worse—under different practices. Models can help inspire that confidence.

Models can also guide districts in designing, implementing, and maintaining programs. They can suggest structural approaches to instruction and various teaching practices. A well-developed model can show principal actors in the system how different techniques work together, indicate required resources, and provide concrete examples for training. Such guidance is especially valuable for districts that, unlike several of our sites, can't or don't want to undertake extensive development efforts.

This is not to say that one "best model" can serve in every environment. Our study sites took diverse approaches in developing their programs, and those programs were strong largely because they accommodated local realities and priorities. Given the considerable differences among school districts, practitioners and university-based educators should work together to

develop models and materials suitable to a variety of settings, resource bases, and educational philosophies. These field-based practices could become the nucleus of a dissemination/demonstration network that would support wider adoption efforts.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The shift to substantive arts education will require professional development at all levels of the system. Without that development, the present state of affairs will simply perpetuate itself. People form their impression of art's importance and their ideas about shaping the arts curriculum during their post-secondary education. Consequently, development activities for university personnel are crucial to modifying the cycle in which "teachers teach as they were taught."[1] Art education professors and teacher training faculty must be exposed to the theories, principles, and practices that inform a discipline-based art program. And they must provide teachers, administrators, and other educators with relevant training.

In addition to pre-service training, university personnel have a crucial role in in-service education and special workshop efforts. Few districts have curriculum specialists or teachers who can translate theories of art and art education into a comprehensive curriculum. University faculty must become aware of their instrumental role in fostering discipline-based art education. They should serve as theoreticians, expanding the conceptual vision of local educators and bringing conceptual consistency to local plans. They can help translate theory into practice, interpreting abstract principles and making curriculum sequence reflect what is known about child development. Without such collaboration between academics and practitioners, there is little hope that theory will inform practice, especially in art history and criticism.

Both generalist and specialist teachers must have professional education in the concept of substantive art education and in the skills necessary for teaching a discipline-based program that balances the three domains. Unless they intend to be art specialists, students preparing to be teachers have token art training, and usually only in production. Even the training received by specialist teachers emphasizes production, scanting both art history and art criticism. If teachers are not well trained in program approaches and do not confidently understand the philosophical base and necessary techniques, classroom practices are unlikely to change greatly, consistently, or in the intended direction.

Teacher training and retraining will have the most immediate effects on the quality of art instruction. However, unless non-art educators and administrators realize their roles and responsibilities, no amount of teacher training can transform art education. Central office staff and principals also need professional development to learn their roles in promoting and supporting strong visual arts programs and guaranteeing the consistency and quality of classroom practice. Our study showed repeatedly how pivotal their influence is for teachers' response to changes and for giving the arts "legitimate" status in the curriculum. These considerations are especially important in light of the arts' traditionally peripheral status.

LACK OF A KNOWLEDGE BASE

None of the issues so far discussed can be resolved without an adequate knowledge base that includes information vital to immediate policy problems and long-range theoretical concerns. Information needed for the former is largely statistical. It would answer questions about:

---

[1] L. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Consistency and Change in American Classrooms, 1890–1930*, Longman, New York, 1984.

- The number of art educators practicing in the nation's schools,
- How much and what kind of art education schools offer,
- Art education enrollments at the secondary level,
- The courses available to future art educators and generalist teachers,
- High school graduation and college entrance requirements across the country.

This census-like information is necessary to sketch the policy problems facing art educators and to justify developing strategies that will mobilize support.

However, the knowledge base must also include the findings of theoretical investigations. These findings will support development of practice and of an agenda for continuing research and scholarship. For example:

- Although evaluation involves practical issues, it also raises fundamental theoretical questions. What multiple outcomes are associated with visual arts education? What is their relationship? What standards could be used to measure the success of a discipline-based, three domain program? The answers are essential to the vitality and security of art education.
- It has been much harder to develop support for discipline-based art programs at the secondary than at the elementary level. Why is this so? Are there productive and realistic ways to connect elementary and secondary instruction in the visual arts? Is a K-12 curriculum feasible? These questions must be answered because without continuity at the secondary level, a substantive art program cannot realize its ultimate educational goals.
- Art specialists are crucial to the health and quality of art programs. However, many districts do not have art education specialists to support their programs. Can art specialists multiply the effects of their skills and expertise by assuming new roles or revising traditional ones? As our study suggests, can they reach more students and affect practice more as facilitators and coordinators rather than in their traditional role of instructor? These questions are crucial because art specialists are essential for realizing the goals of a discipline-based, sequential program.

This discussion suggests how interrelated these issues are and how their resolution will influence the possibility of strong art education in this country. It would be counterproductive to generate political support without program models to fill the resulting requests. Getting educators interested in art education can only breed frustration without concomitant political support or programmatic development. Similarly, scholars and researchers cannot be expected to maintain their commitment to the theoretical and conceptual issues inherent in the arts if they find little effective audience for their research. In short, strong art education cannot become a reality unless art advocates, policymakers, educators, and researchers develop strategies to simultaneously promote support for change, put model programs in place, encourage professional development, and build the knowledge base to guide and enlighten art education practice.